

limitation had been amended to "forming an optical member on the top surface of the base member by curing the optical member precursor" in the November 28, 2005, Amendment.

During the February 2, 2006, telephone interview, Examiner Stevenson agreed to issue a Supplemental Office Action to correct this error and to be responsive to the November 28 Amendment. However, as of today, Applicants have not received the Supplemental Amendment. To expedite prosecution, Applicants file this Response in reply to the outstanding Office Action, and to the indication that the Supplemental Office Action would reject the claims on similar grounds, as indicated by Examiner Stevenson during the February 2, 2006, telephone interview.

In view of the above, the outstanding Office Action is not responsive to the November 28 Amendment. Applicants have not been provided with the Examiner's adequate rationale regarding the rejection of the pending claims. Therefore, the next rejection, if any, should be non-final.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,838,361 to Takeo; and rejects claims 10, 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takeo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,761,925 to Banno et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The November 28 Amendment amended the claims to recite "forming an optical member on the top surface of the base member by curing the optical member precursor." The Office Action asserts that Takeo discloses forming an optical member on the top surface of a base member at col. 9, lines 4-20. However, Takeo at col. 9, lines 4-20 does not disclose or suggest such a feature.

Takeo discloses dropping a second material on a substrate in regions where the first material has been completely removed. See col. 6, lines 21-24, lines 41-46, and lines 61-66. Thus, although the second material may be arguably dropped on top of the first material

("base member"), the second material is not on the first material when an optical member is formed from the second material. Thus, Takeo does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 10 and 12.

Banno does not disclose or suggest forming an optical member on the top surface of the base member by curing the optical member precursor. Therefore, Banno does not supply the subject matter lacking in Takeo. Thus, Takeo and Banno, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 10 and 12, and claims 2-9, 11 and 13-16 depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/sqb
Date: March 24, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--